

a remarkable job in providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate this rate of development. It is a testament to the current growth management program, and to the City Council and staff that we are doing so well. We all hear the complaints about growth, but Chula Vista has handled this level of growth so well, and has maintained a dedication to continuing to improve the City.

Eight of the eleven quality of life thresholds were determined to be in compliance. These include:

Fiscal, Air Quality, Sewer, Water, Drainage, Fire/EMS, Traffic, Schools

Three of the thresholds had at least partial non-compliance: the library is below the square footage threshold standard, but a completion of the Rancho del Rey branch library.

The Police threshold has two components, Emergency and Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences response time threshold for percentage of responses within standard threshold was again met for the period of July 1-December 31.

For Parks and Recreation, the park acreage per 1,000 population threshold was not met, and the average response time for this type of calls has declined for the past year. For Parks and Recreation, the park acreage per 1,000 population threshold was not met, and the average response time for this type of calls has declined for the past year.

In addition, one threshold had a technical compliance issue: For Traffic, the Heritage Road segment between Telegraph Canyon and the 160 Freeway was not meeting the design speed reflecting a high level of service (LOS), but a signal timing study at the interchanges resulted in intersection delays and a temporary closure.

Also, the Fire/EMS response time threshold was met for calendar year, as had been the case prior to 2000, rather than annual reports.)

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of findings, and recommendations to the City Council.

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC's) principal task is to monitor the City's progress in providing the community's quality of life and to recommend corrective action that can make a difference. This is an important and vital service that the independent citizen body, as the GMOC, to provide this kind of service.

The GMOC takes seriously its role as monitoring the impacts of growth. GMOC membership also believes that they have a responsibility to monitor a part of the formal GMOC purview, but may impact the quality of life in the City. It is also recognized that there may be some actions that the City can take to address such concerns, however, the GMOC membership has a responsibility to monitor the City's progress to avoid duplication of effort, to be mindful of the appropriate use of resources, and to ensure that the City is meeting its obligations to the community.



GMOC

Growth Management Oversight Commission

2006 Annual Report

The GMOC membership has a responsibility to monitor the City's progress in providing the community's quality of life and to recommend corrective action that can make a difference. This is an important and vital service that the independent citizen body, as the GMOC, to provide this kind of service. The GMOC membership also believes that they have a responsibility to monitor a part of the formal GMOC purview, but may impact the quality of life in the City. It is also recognized that there may be some actions that the City can take to address such concerns, however, the GMOC membership has a responsibility to monitor the City's progress to avoid duplication of effort, to be mindful of the appropriate use of resources, and to ensure that the City is meeting its obligations to the community. The GMOC membership also believes that they have a responsibility to monitor a part of the formal GMOC purview, but may impact the quality of life in the City. It is also recognized that there may be some actions that the City can take to address such concerns, however, the GMOC membership has a responsibility to monitor the City's progress to avoid duplication of effort, to be mindful of the appropriate use of resources, and to ensure that the City is meeting its obligations to the community.

Fiscal



Air Quality



Sewer



Water



Libraries



Drainage



Parks & Recreation



Police



Fire/EMS



Traffic



Schools



Volume 1

CITY OF CHULA VISTA

GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2006 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/04 to 6/30/05
To the Current Time
And Five-Year Forecast to December 2010

Commission Members

Michael Spethman, Chairman (Center City)
David W. Krogh, Vice Chair (Sweetwater/Bonita)
Arthur M. Garcia (Education)
Steve Palma (Southwest)
Richard Arroyo (Business)
Joe Little (Eastern Territories)
Matthew Waters (Development)
Maria Moya (Environmental)
William Tripp (Planning Commission)

Staff

Mark Stephens, Growth Management Coordinator (from January 9, 2006)
Daniel Forster, Growth Management Coordinator (through January 6, 2006)
Rabbia Phillip, Management Assistant

City of Chula Vista
Planning and Building Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

June 2006

**Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 06-01) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2006-185) on June 15, 2006**

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

June 2006

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Michael Spethman, Chairperson
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2006 GMOC Annual Report (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005, to the Current Time and Five-Year Forecast)

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the various City department staff as well as the school districts, water districts, and Air Pollution Control District in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Rabbia Phillip, Mark Stephens and Ed Batchelder, as well as former Growth Management Coordinator Dan Forster, who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice Chair, David Krogh, Steve Palma, Art Garcia, Richard Arroyo, Joe Little, Matt Waters, Maria Moya, and Bill Tripp. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

Over the last few years the GMOC has been in the lead identifying ways we can become more responsive to the community and effective in our message to Council. The most important aspects of those changes have been:

- Holding regular public workshops;
- Focusing greater attention on western Chula Vista; and,
- Having greater future vision, by dealing with current issues and looking critically at the next five-year time period.

This report includes a brief update on the status of proposed changes to the Growth Management Program as a result of the "Top to Bottom" program review conducted. Over the past year, the new Growth Management Element of the General Plan has been adopted, and a draft of an updated Growth Management Ordinance and a draft Program Guidelines Document are being completed for review. The proposed Growth Management Program changes will be presented shortly after this year's annual review.

While Chula Vista continues to be one of the fastest growing cities in the region and the state, the City has done a remarkable job in providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate this rate of development. It is a testament to the current growth management program, and all the individual actions that have taken place, that we are doing so well. We all hear the complaints about growth, but I know of no other jurisdiction that has

handled this level of growth so well, and has maintained a desirable city image. At the same time, the GMOC is dedicated to continuing to improve the City.

Eight of the eleven quality of life thresholds were determined by the GMOC to be in compliance, and these include:

- Fiscal
- Air Quality
- Sewer
- Water
- Drainage
- Fire/EMS
- Traffic
- Schools

Three of the thresholds had at least partial non-compliance:

- Library is below the square footage threshold standard, but a program is in place to correct this through completion of the Rancho del Rey branch library.
- The Police threshold has two components, Emergency and Urgent response times. The emergency (Priority 1) response time threshold for percentage of responses within seven minutes was narrowly missed (although the threshold was again met for the period of July 1-December 31, 2005). The urgent (Priority 2) response time was not met, and the average response time for this type of calls has declined for the past three years.
- For Parks and Recreation, the park acreage per 1,000 population temporarily dipped slightly below the three-acre standard for eastern Chula Vista as a result of a delay in opening Veterans Park, but the standard is again met with opening of the park along with other new park space.

In addition, one threshold had a technical compliance issue:

- For Traffic, the Heritage Road segment between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway has a free flow speed reflecting a high level of service (LOS), but a signal timing issue influenced by reconstruction of I-805 interchanges resulted in intersection delays and a temporary LOS E condition.

Also, the Fire/EMS response time threshold was met for calendar year 2005. (Data were presented for the calendar year, as had been the case prior to 2000, rather than a fiscal year period as used the last several annual reports.)

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of the eleven threshold standards, identified issues, findings, and recommendations to the City Council.

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA
GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
2006 ANNUAL REPORT**

Table of Contents

<i>GMOC Chair Cover Memo</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview</i>	<i>3</i>
<u>1.0 INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>4</u>
1.1 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).....	4
1.2 Review Process	4
1.3 Growth Forecast	5
1.4 Report Organization.....	5
<u>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE.....</u>	<u>8</u>
3.1 FISCAL.....	8
3.1.1 Five Year Fiscal Forecast	8
3.2 AIR QUALITY	9
3.2.1 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement	9
3.2.2 Alternative Fueled Vehicles	10
3.3 SEWER.....	12
3.3.1 Long Term Treatment Capacity	12
3.4 WATER	14
3.4.1 Water Availability and Distribution	14
3.5 LIBRARIES	15
3.5.1 Library Building Plan	15
3.6 DRAINAGE.....	17
3.6.1 Enhancing the Existing Drainage System	17
3.7 PARKS & RECREATION	18
3.7.1 Land Threshold.....	18
3.7.2 Park and Recreation Facilities	19
3.8 POLICE	20
3.8.1 Priority 1 Threshold.....	21
3.8.2 Priority 2 Threshold.....	21
3.8.3 Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes.....	22
3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES	23
3.9.1 Maintaining Response Time Threshold.....	23
3.9.2 Reporting Management Tool.....	24
3.10 TRAFFIC.....	25

3.10.1	Traffic Signal Adjustment.....	25
3.10.2	Format of Tables	25
3.11	SCHOOLS.....	27
3.11.1	GMOC School Recommendations.....	28
3.11.2	School District Accomplishments.....	28
3.11.3	City Assistance.....	28
3.12	OTHER TOPICS.....	30
3.12.1	New Challenges in Western Chula Vista.....	30
3.12.2	Comprehensive Listing of Facility Master Plans and Related Plans.....	30
3.12.3	Public Comments.....	30
<u>4.0</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES.....</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>5.0</u>	<u>APPENDICES.....</u>	<u>32</u>
5.1	Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementing Actions	A-1
5.2	Appendix B – Workshop Report (see Volume II)	
5.3	Appendix C – Growth Forecast (see Volume II)	
5.4	Appendix D – Threshold Questionnaires and Supplemental Data (see Volume II)	

Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC's) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the city has the ability to act and can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body, as the GMOC, to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role as monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that they have a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be a part of the formal GMOC purview, but may impact the quality of life for the current and future residents of the City. It is also recognized that there may be no recourse, no action that the City can take either legally or practically, to address such concerns. It is important, however, for the issues to be raised so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, to be mindful of the appropriate roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

The GMOC membership is pleased to say that overall the quality of life in the City of Chula Vista is being maintained and indeed even improved. The master planned communities of eastern Chula Vista are quickly becoming one of the most desirable and relatively affordable places to live in the county. The prospects for redevelopment in the west give rise for opportunities for physical improvements to be realized as they have in the east. Other exciting initiatives are progressing for the Chula Vista Bayfront and a new University Park and Research Center.

Some attributes of physical development in western Chula Vista will be addressed as the redevelopment process proceeds. Depending upon the rate of this growth, some of the pre-existing need issues may linger for what many feel is too long. Providing parks, curbs-gutters and sidewalks for the southwestern area of the city is being done, and this is recognized and appreciated. So when the GMOC indicates that more is also desired, it is done with recognition and thanks for the significant achievements we have seen in recent years. And, we recognize that the tax base provided by our eastern growth has helped to fund these improvements.

With adoption of the Chula Vista's updated General Plan in December 2005, the City achieved a major milestone, and set in place a new vision for future growth and development over the next 25 years. The new General Plan includes an updated Growth Management Element that provides a framework for continuing evolution of the City's Growth Management Program. A revised Growth Management Ordinance and a Growth Management Program Guidelines document will soon be presented.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs. To provide an independent, annual, City-wide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas, a member of the Planning Commission, and a cross section of interests including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three time frames:

1. A fiscal year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations, which may have budget implications; therefore the report focuses on the previous fiscal year for detailed data collection, which in this case is July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005.
2. Pertinent issues identified during the second half of 2005 and early 2006 are also addressed. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events.
3. A five-year forecast covering the period from January 2006 through December 2010 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

During this process, the GMOC encourages each City Department and outside agency that has responsibility for reporting on the threshold status to review the appropriateness of the threshold and whether new thresholds and or standards should be considered.

1.2 Review Process

The GMOC has held 13 meetings from July 2005 through May 2006. In addition, GMOC members participated in a City field trip. City Departments and external agencies completed threshold questionnaires. GMOC members reviewed the questionnaires and, where necessary, asked department or agency representatives to appear in person to make clarifications and to answer questions. In addition, the GMOC held a community workshop on June 7, 2006.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council. This occurs at a public hearing typically held in May or June.

1.3 Growth Forecast

In late September 2005 the GMOC “Preliminary” Five Year Growth Forecast was issued, and in early June 2006 an updated forecast document was completed¹. The forecast was issued to provide departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the magnitude of residential growth to be anticipated over the over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked how their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth. The forecast from January 2006 through December 2010 indicated an additional 15,150 residential units would be permitted for construction in the city, (10,700 in the east and 4,450 units in the west) for an annual average of 2,140 in the east and 890 units in the west, or just over 3,000 housing units permitted per year on average citywide.

One of the assumptions of that forecast was that “Building caps are not imposed on development”. The City, with the voluntary cooperation of the development community, acted to moderate growth in April 2003 by instituting a “Permit Monitoring Program.” This program established a maximum number of permits that could be issued for selected major projects in eastern Chula Vista over three 12-month time periods extending through March 2006. This measure was intended to moderate growth over that three-year period so that the City’s Growth Management traffic threshold was not exceeded. The system lowered the number of permits for that period, but should not affect the longer term forecast. Also, with rising interest rates and general slowing of residential development on a regional basis over the past year, the number of residential units permitted in Chula Vista has declined from recent highs. The estimate of 15,550 residential units over the next five years provides a relatively high standard that facility and service levels are measured against to be prudent. Annual updates will be provided.

1.4 Report Organization

In Section 2 the report provides summary tables of the threshold findings for both the most recent review period and what is expected over the next 5 years.

Section 3 provides a threshold by threshold presentation, presents discussions, issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern, and recommendations as may be made.

Section 4 addresses the status of recommended changes in growth management program thresholds, implementation measures, and organizational issues described in the 2005 Annual Report.

¹ The updated forecast document reflects actual building permits issued and housing units finalized in calendar year 2005 and California Department of Finance annual estimates issued in early May. The forecast is in Appendix C and is available on the City’s web site.

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

2006 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/04 THROUGH 6/30/05		
Topic	Threshold Not Met	Threshold Met
Fiscal		X
Air Quality		X
Sewer		X
Water		X
Libraries	X	
Drainage		X
Parks & Recreation		
<i>Land</i>	X	
<i>Facilities</i>		X
Police		
Priority I	X	
Priority II	X	
Fire/EMS		X
Traffic		X
Schools		
<i>Chula Vista Elementary School District</i>		X
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>		X

**2006 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY
AND FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT
January 2006 through December 2010**

Threshold	Threshold Will Be Met	Threshold Likely Met	Potential for Future Non-Compliance	Statement of Concern	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
Fiscal	X				
Air Quality	X				
Sewer	X				
Water	X				
Libraries			X		X
Drainage		X			
Parks and Recreation					
<i>Land</i>		X			
<i>Facilities</i>		X			
Police					
<i>Priority I (81%/Average)</i>		X			
<i>Priority II (57%/Average)</i>			X		
Fire/EMS			X		
Traffic		X			
Schools					
<i>Chula Vista Elementary</i>		X			
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>		X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE

3.1 FISCAL

Threshold: The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5- to 7-year period.

The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: In Compliance

Future: Threshold Will Be Met

3.1.1 Five-Year Fiscal Forecast

Discussion: The GMOC was provided with a five-year fiscal forecast. Based upon this information the city's growth is anticipated to produce the kinds of land uses that will generate the level of revenue so that the facilities, services, and maintenance needs that will be demanded by this growth will, overall, also be paid for by this growth. The GMOC appreciates the comprehensive information provided in this year's report.

Recommendation: No recommendations at this time.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

Threshold:

The GMOC Shall Be Provided With An Annual Report Which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/or are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: In Compliance

Future: Threshold Will Be Met

3.2.1 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement

The GMOC supports the efforts being undertaken by the City of Chula Vista to improve local and regional air quality. The City continues to implement several measures contained in the Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Reduction Plan adopted by the City Council on November 14, 2000. Following is an explanation of the non-development related air quality programs identified as Action Measures in the CO₂ Reduction Plan that have been updated during the reporting period:

Purchase of Alternative Fuel Vehicles

The City's alternative fuel vehicles inventory has been expanded to include:

- Chula Vista Transit has 32 CNG Busses (Chula Vista Transit received 7 new 2005 CNG busses and retired 7 diesel busses).
- The Nature Center received a dedicated CNG bus in June 2005.
- Four hybrid vehicles: Three Ford Hybrid SUV's and Honda Civic Hybrid (revised per correction from Dave Byers, Director of Public Works Operations, June 2006)

Municipal Building Upgrades and Trip Reduction

The City adopted a Building Energy Efficiency policy in February 2005.

The policy requires the following:

- Staff to present options to City Council that exceed state energy efficiency standards (Title 24) by 20% for renovation and new construction of city facilities.
- Staff to propose renewable energy options for all city building related projects. The goal is to offset 20% of the city's energy use with non-fossil fuel based renewable energy.
- EnergyStar rated equipment be purchased for projects.
- Green Power be purchased for city facilities when available.

In addition to the CO₂ Reduction Plan measures, the City has initiated the following:

Transportation Demand Management

- In March 2003, the City was awarded a \$414,325 grant by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District to develop and implement a transportation demand management program. The program includes an express bus from eastern Chula Vista to downtown San Diego and an express shuttle from eastern Chula Vista to a trolley stop. Council accepted the grants in April 2004 and the service was launched in November 2005. The express bus and express shuttle service has carried an average of over 1,000 passengers/month since the start of 2006. The City received a Diamond Award from SANDAG for this innovative program.

3.2.2 Alternative Fueled Vehicles and Fueling Stations

Discussion:

While it is recognized that the issue of air quality should be addressed on a regional basis, the City of Chula Vista is moving forward in several areas to lower energy consumption and emissions. One area that was of interest to the GMOC in last year's report concerned the acquisition of or conversion of City vehicles using alternative fuels. In response to a previous GMOC recommendation, a draft City policy position regarding the acquisition and use of alternative fueled vehicles has been prepared for review. The policy has not been finalized for City Council consideration.

Comment:

The GMOC looks forward to receiving the draft or adopted City policy regarding use of alternative fueled vehicles. The GMOC also supports provision of additional stations for alternative fuels, including providing planned public access to the CNG Fueling Facility at the John Lippitt Public Works Center, a site in conjunction with the Auto Park, given the auto orientation of that area, and other strategic locations in Chula Vista convenient to drivers.

3.3 SEWER

Threshold:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12-18 month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
 - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
 - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
 - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - d. Other relevant information.

The Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: In Compliance

Future: Threshold Will Be Met

3.3.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

Discussion:

In about five years the City's current contracted capacity rights with METRO are expected to be exceeded. However, with an allocation from the South Bay Treatment Plant, additional capacity will be available.

For the longer-term capacity needs it is the understanding of the GMOC that the Wastewater Master Plan has determined the need to acquire approximately 5 MGD of additional treatment capacity. It is also understood that negotiations to acquire those rights are ongoing, and that a variety of options is also being assessed within the defined cost parameters. The GMOC appreciates the complexity of these negotiations.

SEWAGE Flow and Treatment Capacity							
	01/02 Fiscal Year	02/03 Fiscal Year	03/04 Fiscal Year	04/05 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Buildout"
Average Flow (MGD)	15.316	15.951	16.6	17.0	17.44	20.22	26.2*
Capacity	19.843	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**

* Buildout Projection based on the General Plan Update preferred alternative.

** Increase in capacity is based on the allocation of additional capacity rights resulting from the construction of the new South Bay Treatment Plant (allocation process still under way).

Recommendation:

That:

- (1) the GMOC be advised regarding the allocation of treatment capacity to Chula Vista from the South Bay Sewage Treatment Facility, and
- (2) the status of negotiations to acquire capacity rights with Metro for the City's long-term sewage treatment requirements and other related efforts.

3.4 WATER

Threshold:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:
 - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
 - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
 - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
 - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: In Compliance

Future: Threshold Will Be Met

3.4.1 Water Availability and Distribution

Discussion:

Both of the major water districts serving the City of Chula Vista, the Otay Water District and the Sweetwater Authority, report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Chula Vista has been a leader in water conservation and the recycled water distribution system has been expanded in the master planned communities of eastern Chula Vista through efforts with the Otay Water District and the development community. The GMOC supports these efforts as a way to limit potable water demands and maximize efficient use of available water supplies. The GMOC also supports the efforts of the Sweetwater Authority to address the feasibility of recycled water use in western Chula Vista.

Recommendation:

That recycled water use be maximized where feasible throughout the City.

3.5 LIBRARIES

Threshold: The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

CURRENT

Not in Compliance

FUTURE

Potential for Future Non-Compliance

3.5.1 Library Building Plan

Issue: With the community's continued population growth prior to completion of a new branch library, the ratio of gross square feet of library space has fallen below the threshold standard of 500 gross square feet per 1,000 population.

The Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000 square foot full-service, regional library in Rancho del Rey. This library will be constructed on City-owned property located at East H Street and Paseo Ranchero. The City has a design/build agreement to complete a 31,200 square foot library by the end of calendar year 2007.

According to the Growth Management Program, "Should the GMOC determine that the Threshold Standard is not being satisfied, then the City Council shall formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into compliance. Construction or other actual solutions shall be scheduled to commence within three years."

As stated above, with construction of the Rancho del Rey library expected to commence this calendar year and be completed in 2007, no additional action is needed if this schedule is met.

With growth forecast over the next five years, the threshold would again be approached over the latter part of the forecast period, and could again fall

just below the 500 square feet/1,000 population standard by the end of 2010. The existing library at EastLake High School, which previously was assumed to close as a City branch library when the Rancho del Rey facility opens, is now to remain until the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) branch library opens. Planning is also commencing for the EUC.

The City has taken a proactive position and is continuing to actively pursue the Rancho del Rey Library Planning/Building Plan Program and has placed as a priority the identification of construction funding. The principal reason for the delay was to await notification of whether a library construction grant had been received. Unfortunately, the city was not successful in being awarded that grant. The new library is being funded through development impact fees collected.

Recommendations:

That the City Council direct the City Manager to:

- 1) Continue efforts to expedite delivery of the new Rancho del Rey branch library;
- 2) Actively pursue planning for a new Eastern Urban Center branch library;
- 3) Continue to assess the optimum hours of operation in terms of serving the needs of service area patrons;
- 4) Assess ultimate future library needs based upon the increased capacity for future growth provided by the City's updated General Plan, and accordingly update the Library Facilities Master Plan.

3.6 DRAINAGE

Threshold: Stormwater flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.

The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives listed above.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: **Threshold Met**

Future: **Threshold Likely Met**

3.6.1 Enhancing the Existing Drainage System

Discussion: The City has programs in place to address drainage associated with new growth and development. Additional challenges are faced in some older areas of Chula Vista where drainage systems may not meet contemporary standards or have deteriorated. For several years the GMOC has supported and strongly encouraged the City's efforts to replace aging and in some cases dilapidated corrugated metal pipe (CMP), and has also urged that more be done. While the failure of CMP is not a problem that has arisen as a result of growth, the potential for pipe failures affects the community's quality of life. Among the challenges in some areas are limitations on access through private property to reach pipe that may be in need of repair. If drainage problems and flooding occur, they not only affect surrounding properties, but also may constrain the potential for future intensification and redevelopment in some areas. The recently completed comprehensive televising of the CMP system provides a basis for identifying the most pressing needs.

The GMOC looks forward to completion of the City's Drainage Report that will look at drainage deficiencies, project priorities, and funding sources.

The GMOC has also expressed concerns regarding external constraints to downstream drainage channel maintenance.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to provide status reports addressing drainage projects to the GMOC twice per year, generally coinciding with submittal of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget, and submittal of the annual GMOC questionnaire response. The GMOC supports continuing efforts to secure additional funding for enhancements to the drainage system and to be proactive in minimizing the potential for future drainage and flooding problems.

3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

Threshold: Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current: *Threshold Not Met**

Land: Actual: 2.94 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805

Facilities: Actual Facilities – Based on Parks Master Plan

Future:

LAND: *Threshold Likely Met*

FACILITY: *Threshold Likely Met*

* With opening of Veterans Park and other new parks, the land threshold is again met.

3.7.1 Land Threshold

Discussion: The eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory as of June 30, 2005 provided adequate acreage to accommodate up to 99,794 persons with the 3 acres per 1,000 standard. With a June 30, 2005 estimated eastern Chula Vista population of 101,800, a developed park acreage shortfall of approximately six acres was identified. This is attributable primarily to a delay in opening Veterans Park to spring 2006. With opening of Veterans Park (10.5 acres), along with Horizon Park (5.3 acres), Winding Walk Park (7.12 acres), Monteville Park (29 acres), Salt Creek Park (19.8 acres) and Mountain Hawk Park 12 acres, an additional 82.72 acres is projected to be available by mid-2006. This would leave a residual of 51.12 acres of parkland to help meet the 2006-2010 need.

The 18-month forecast calls for an eastern Chula Vista population of 110,670 (an increase of 8,870); therefore, the current inventory will need to be increased by 32.6 acres (including the six-acre shortfall referenced above) to meet the 18-month forecast. With a 2010 forecast of 137,315 in eastern Chula Vista (a gain of 26,645), 79.9 acres of additional parkland will be needed. Subtracting the 51.12 residual acres identified in the preceding paragraph, 28.78 additional acres of parkland would be required through 2010. With San Miguel Community Park, Otay Ranch Village Seven neighborhood parks and phase 1 of Otay Ranch Community Park in Village Two scheduled for construction by December 2010, approximately 37.4 acres would be added, providing a total eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory of 420.5 acres, capable of accommodating 140,167 persons, which exceeds the forecast of 137,315.

The GMOC commends the efforts to deliver the new Harborside Park in western Chula Vista, and the largest park development program in the City's history with a number of key facilities including new parks and recreation centers in eastern Chula Vista coming on line in 2006.

The GMOC looks forward to receiving updated studies and plans that address how future parkland and facility needs will be addressed in western Chula Vista, including the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Comment:

The GMOC would like to again go on record to reiterate its position that park acreage counted toward the 3 acres per 1,000-population threshold standard is limited to neighborhood and community parkland. Acreages for school facilities, recreation-based community purpose facilities, and other similar types of sites should not be included in the threshold calculation.

3.7.2 Park and Recreation Facilities

Discussion:

New parks are equipped based upon the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Parks Development Ordinance and master plans for individual park facilities. The overall need in eastern Chula Vista is not met for certain types of facilities (e.g., basketball courts and practice/informal softball fields and soccer fields) when using only the City's public park sites, while other types of facilities (e.g., picnic tables) exceed the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan standard. Per the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the provision of recreational facilities at other locations, such as schools and recreation-based community purpose facilities is characterized as necessary to meet the overall demand. As noted above, the GMOC has expressed concerns regarding the provision of needed recreational facilities at other types of sites beyond public parks. The GMOC does not consider school sites and space as counting toward the space requirement. Access to school recreational facilities is, for example, often limited for the general public. The GMOC understands the need to look at new models and approaches in meeting recreational facility needs, particularly in the developed areas of western Chula Vista.

Recommendation:

That the City Council direct the City Manager to complete the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update as soon as feasible, along with an active effort to identify new sites and a program for funding anticipated new growth needs in western Chula Vista. The GMOC also recommends to the City Council that in planning the future development of a major city park, the City of Chula Vista centennial anniversary in 2011 be taken into consideration, where a park or parks could reflect a theme related to Chula Vista's history and accomplishments.

3.8 POLICE

Threshold:

*Emergency Response*¹: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

*Urgent Response*²: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II, urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.30 minutes) or less (measured annually).

THRESHOLD FINDING:

CURRENT:

Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Not Met

Emergency response average time: Threshold Met

Urgent response within 7 minutes: Threshold Not Met

Urgent response average time: Threshold Not Met

FUTURE:

Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Met

Emergency response average time: Threshold Likely Met

Urgent response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Not Met

Urgent response average time: Threshold Likely Not Met

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
Actual			
Emergency Response	80.0%	7 minutes	5:11 min./sec.
Urgent Response	40.5%	7 minutes	11:40 min./sec.

1 Priority 1 - Emergency Calls. Life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

2 Priority 2 - Urgent Calls. Misdemeanor in progress; possibility of severe injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglary alarms. Response: immediate response by one or two officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.).

3.8.1 Priority 1 Threshold

Discussion:

After five consecutive years of improved performance relative to meeting the threshold for the percentage of Priority 1 call responses within seven minutes, the Police Department fell slightly below the 81% threshold in FY 2004-05. While the average response time standard (5 minutes and 30 seconds) was met and the amount below the threshold is small (i.e., 13 calls out of nearly 1,300), this concerned the GMOC. For the period of July 2005 through December 2005, the GMOC is pleased to note that performance for Priority 1 calls (83.8%) was significantly improved and well within the threshold. Therefore, the GMOC is not making any additional recommendations beyond requesting the Police Department to closely monitor performance in meeting this threshold.

3.8.2 Priority 2 Threshold

PRIORITY II CFS – Urgent Response, Calls for Service*			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		57.0%	7:30
FY 2004-05	16,889 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	16,526 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	15,024 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38
FY 1994-95	21,900 of 73,485	63.4%	6:49

* These figures do not include responses to false alarms beginning in FY 2002-03. All other Priority 2 calls received and dispatched with a final priority of 2 are included.

Discussion:

The Priority 2 Threshold has not been met for several years, as illustrated in the table above. In addition to the decline in performance relative to this threshold during FY 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005), over the period of July 2005 – December 2005, the Priority 2 response (% within 7 minutes and average response time) performance further declined (to 38.2% and 12 minutes and 45 seconds). Police Department analysis of Priority 2 calls by time of day indicates that the number of Priority 2 calls has increased

significantly, much more so than Priority 1 calls. The number of Police Officers on duty (i.e., authorized and filled positions with sworn staff on duty) declined during the FY 2004 reporting period to be well below the amount of authorized staffing (as low as 182 compared to 231 authorized). This was due to factors such as on-duty injuries and officers in field training, rather than growth of the city.

The highest percentage of longer response times for Priority 2 calls was experienced in the late afternoon through the evening during the swing shift, and the Police Department has suggested that the first new officers available be assigned to the swing shift as one way to address this response time issue.

The GMOC supports measures to ensure timely full staffing of on-duty officers and deployment of resources to meet the peak demands. The GMOC understands that the City Council has approved an increase in the advance hire program for police officers to help address the lag time involved in hiring and training new officers as vacancies occur.

While the GMOC agrees that there is more to the quality of police service than response times, response time is an established community norm that is expected to be met. If it is not met, there should be quality of service measures that can be directly associated with a Priority 2 response presented to the GMOC as evidence that in total there remains an acceptable level of service.

The Police Department has requested GMOC support for various upgrades/improvements. While the GMOC is not opposed to any of these, it would be beneficial to understand how implementation of any of these initiatives will specifically improve Priority 2 response times.

Recommendation:

That the City Council direct the City Manager to have the Police Department prepare and implement an action plan addressing the decline in performance relative to meeting the GMOC threshold for Priority 2 calls. The GMOC recommends that this be done expeditiously so that progress in developing and implementing the plan can be reflected in the Police Department's report in next year's GMOC review.

3.8.3 Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes

Discussion:

During the current reporting period, 6.4% of Priority 1 calls (65 of the 1,023 calls available for analysis) had response times greater than 10 minutes. The most frequent type of P1 calls with response times over 10 minutes were robbery alarm calls, which are almost always false¹. Other P1 calls with response times over 10 minutes included attempted suicide and overdose calls. The most typical reasons for P1 response times over 10 minutes were (1) lengthy distances had to be traveled to provide a response; and, (2) a limited number of units were available to respond.

¹ A 2002 study of robbery/duress alarm calls to the Department found that 99.7% were false.

3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold: Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

THRESHOLD FINDING:

CURRENT: *Threshold Met*

FUTURE: *Potential for Future Non-Compliance*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
Actual		
Emergency Response	81.6	7 minutes

3.9.1 Maintaining Response Time Threshold

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times Since 1994		
Years	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes
CY 2005	9,907	81.6%
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%
CY 1999	6,344	77.2%
CY 1998	4,119	81.9%
CY 1997	6,275	82.4%
CY 1996	6,103	79.4%
CY 1995	5,885	80.0%
CY 1994	5,701	81.7%

Discussion: The Fire response time threshold was met during calendar year 2005 for the first time in several years, even with a substantial increase in the number of reported emergency calls. Dispatch time improved significantly with full operability of its dispatch center. The GMOC commends the Fire Department

for this improvement. As of this writing, additional information is still pending on response time for FY 05. The GMOC is also awaiting the results of the Fire Facility Master Plan update and the study of housing paramedics/ambulance services within the Fire Department.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to complete the Fire Facility Master Plan update and other related studies as soon as feasible.

3.9.2 Reporting Management Tool

Discussion: For several years, the GMOC has recommended that the Fire Department establish a daily reporting function of trip response time by each station by trip as a management tool. During this year's review, the Fire Department provided an example of a monthly reporting format generally along these lines. The Fire Chief reported to the GMOC that this has become a useful management tool and performance incentive. The GMOC is pleased to see that this capability has been re-established for the City dispatching system.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to: 1) continue the recently re-established emergency response reporting function that furnishes information by station and identifies the dispatch, turnout, and travel time components; and 2) ensure an internal review process is in place to address issues identified and take corrective actions in a timely manner when needed. The GMOC also recommends that a consistent reporting period be used in the future for reporting annual response time data. The enhanced tracking and reporting capabilities of the City's system should facilitate this effort.

3.10 TRAFFIC

Threshold:

City-wide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those signalized intersections that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current 1991 LOS, but shall not worsen.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

Current *Threshold Met*

Future *Likely Met*

3.10.1 Traffic Signal Adjustment

Discussion:

In conducting last year’s Traffic Monitoring Program (TMP), it was discovered that the Heritage Road segment between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway was not performing to the appropriate level of service, even with a traffic free flow speed reflecting an LOS of A. Upon investigation it was assessed that the problem lay in the long delays at the intersection due to the traffic signal timing. During the 2005 GMOC review, this was at least partly attributable to the Telegraph Canyon Road/I-805 improvements. During this year’s review, it was at least partly attributable to Olympic Parkway/I-805 improvements. With a high free flow LOS on this segment of Heritage Road and completion of the current interchange improvements, the GMOC views this as a technical compliance issue that should be closely monitored, but does not warrant further action at this time.

3.10.2 Format of Tables

Discussion:

The GMOC requested that a more “reader friendly” format be devised for the tables illustrating road segment threshold compliance. In response, the Engineering Department devised a series of colored maps to show the Level of Service (LOS) on identified segments at a.m., mid-day and p.m. peak traffic periods.

Comment:

The GMOC finds the maps prepared for this year's review to be a useful tool in making the findings easier to understand, commends the Engineering Department for this effort, and requests that this be used in future TMP reviews. At the same time, any enhancements to the tables themselves would also be appreciated.

3.11 SCHOOLS

Threshold:

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local School Districts with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

THRESHOLD FINDING:

CURRENT: Capacity to accommodate students used now or committed.

CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -
Threshold Met

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -
Threshold Met

FORECAST: Ability to accommodate forecasted growth - Funding and site availability for projected new facilities.

CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -
Threshold Likely Met

SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -
Threshold Likely Met

3.11.1 GMOC School Recommendations

- Discussion:** Over the years the GMOC has not been hesitant to raise issues and concerns regarding schools. This year represents continued progress in moving forward in a pragmatic and comprehensive manner. The GMOC supports the proactive efforts of the Sweetwater Union High School District to extend the modernization program beyond completion of Proposition BB improvements (see discussion below), and to secure funding for such a program. The GMOC also supports the ongoing efforts of the Chula Vista Elementary School District to provide additional schools planned in Otay Ranch Village Eleven, Village Seven and Village Two to accommodate continuing growth.
- Recommendation:** The GMOC recommends that agreements for shared use of the Olympic-sized pool facility reflected in plans for the Middle School 12/High School 14 campus in Otay Ranch be addressed as a priority given the high demand anticipated.

3.11.2 School District Accomplishments

- Discussion:** The GMOC is impressed with the level of accomplishments that both school districts have achieved. The financing and construction of new elementary schools are a testament to the functioning of a well operated system. The Sweetwater Union High School District has continued to make major progress. Implementation of the Long Range Facilities Master Plan is bringing older schools up to standard and accommodating continuing growth, and the Proposition BB modernization program is on target to be completed in 2007, 11 years ahead of schedule. These efforts underscore the GMOC's emphasis that school capacity involves many interrelated factors that define an adequate physical environment. The GMOC is confident that we are moving on the right course.
- The financing of future improvements remains perhaps the most critical challenge facing both school districts. This challenge is being met with strategic programming and innovative proposals, which deserve a close review.

3.11.3 City Assistance

- Discussion:** The City is restricted by state law from moderating or slowing growth due to the impacts on schools. At the same time the City has responded to the needs of the school districts by providing data on new growth and facilitating the planning and permit process for construction of new school facilities particularly regarding High School 13, and now Middle School 12/High

School 14 (grades 7-12 campus), as well as planned elementary school facilities. The City has also worked with developers to insure that the necessary roads and utilities are in place when needed to support school construction activities.

The GMOC is pleased to see this level of interagency cooperation and how it is resulting in success. While the school districts and the city are separate political entities with different sets of responsibilities, we are in the end one community with the common goal of improving the quality of life for all our residents.

The GMOC is hopeful that this positive relationship will continue and that all reasonable efforts at how we as a community can achieve our goals will be pursued.

3.12 OTHER TOPICS

A new section has been added to this year's Annual Report to identify other topics that may not fit within a single prior section of the document, but warrant mentioning.

3.12.1 New Challenges in Western Chula Vista

While the GMOC's focus has traditionally been on new growth in eastern Chula Vista, the GMOC in recent years has devoted increased attention to the prospects for changes in western Chula Vista, which is largely already developed. With adoption of the City's General Plan Update, preparation of the Urban Core Specific Plan, and formation of the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation, for instance, the GMOC is attempting to anticipate the growth related issues and challenges associated with a greater focus on this part of the City. Pending revisions to the Growth Management Program resulting from the "Top to Bottom" review also contemplate this.

3.12.2 Comprehensive Listing of Facility Master Plans and Related Plans

Master plans (and/or strategic plans or other related plans) exist or are being prepared or updated for many of the topical areas addressed in growth management thresholds. These topics include:

- Wastewater (Sewer)
- Water
- Libraries
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Police
- Fire
- Schools

The status and contents of the plans are noted in the completed questionnaires and in discussions regarding several of these threshold topics. Creating a comprehensive list of relevant plans and their status can assist the GMOC in reviewing and understanding progress in meeting growth management thresholds.

3.12.3 Public Comments

In addition to the June 7 Community Workshop, public comments have been received during the course of the annual review process. Formal comments received and responses are included in the Appendices.

4.0 RECOMMENDED GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES

One of the GMOC's primary responsibilities under the Growth Management Program is to identify whether any threshold standard should be changed or added. Another focus is on achieving enforcement of the threshold standards through implementation measures. Last year's Annual Report described a comprehensive "Top-to-Bottom" review of the Growth Management Program that was directed by the City Council and concurred with by the GMOC. The recommended changes described in the GMOC 2005 Annual Report were endorsed by the GMOC and approved in principle by the City Council.

The GMOC also served as the core of an Infrastructure and Services Subcommittee for the City's General Plan Update, and in that capacity provided input on, reviewed and recommended adoption of the revised Public Facilities and Services Element and Growth Management Element. The City Council approved the updated General Plan on December 13, 2005.

What remains is to bring forward a new program document and ordinance for the growth management program containing specific language for the recommended changes. With consultant assistance, a draft Guidelines Document was prepared and is undergoing internal review. A revised draft Growth Management Ordinance is also under review. These items are currently scheduled to be presented to the GMOC shortly after this year's Annual Report review cycle. The documents will then be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for action. (Please refer to Section 4 of the 2005 GMOC Annual Report for a summary of recommendations from the Top-to-Bottom review process.)

5.0 APPENDICES

5.1 Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementing Actions

5.2 Appendix B – Workshop Report (Included in Volume II)

5.3 Appendix C – Growth Forecast (Included in Volume II)

**5.4 Appendix D – Threshold Questionnaires and Supplemental Data
(Included in Volume II)**

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p>1. <u>Fiscal</u></p> <p>In compliance. No Recommendations.</p>	<p>1. <u>Fiscal</u></p> <p>Response not required.</p>
<p>2. <u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>In compliance. No Recommendations.</p>	<p>2. <u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Response not required.</p>
<p>3. <u>Sewer</u></p> <p>That the GMOC be advised regarding:</p> <p>1) The allocation of treatment capacity to Chula Vista from the South Bay Sewage Treatment Facility, and</p> <p>2) The status of negotiations to acquire capacity rights with Metro for the City's long-term sewage treatment requirements and other related efforts.</p>	<p>3. <u>Sewer</u></p> <p>1) The City of San Diego has almost completed the financial audits, which drive the allocation calculations since the allocation is based on each participating agency's overall Metro expenditures. City of San Diego staff has indicated that this item will be scheduled for their Council consideration within the next two months.</p> <p>2) Currently the City's acquisition strategy involves a three-pronged effort:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a) Potential purchase of additional capacity from the City of San Diego – Staff has been in discussions with the City of San Diego over the last 2 years. These discussions have been hindered by the recent financial and staffing challenges faced by the City of San Diego, and by the fact that there is no set pricing mechanism that has been established for the valuation of Metro capacity rights. In a recent development, all the participating agencies (including the City of San Diego) agreed to retain a consultant to conduct a valuation study to establish a value that could be used for the sale/transfer of available capacity. This study would then be the basis of negotiations amongst member agencies. It is anticipated that the study will be completed within the next 4-6 months.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b) Potential purchase of additional capacity from other participating</p>

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
	<p>agencies – This option has also faced the same challenge as Option A. The completion of the Capacity Valuation Study mentioned above would form the basis of discussions amongst member agencies. However, in the interim, some of the agencies are going through the process of quantifying their available capacity pending the completion of the study. City staff has notified some of the member agencies informally of the City’s need for additional capacity.</p> <p>c) Explore feasibility of constructing a wastewater reclamation facility – The City is currently in discussions with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority to explore the feasibility of constructing a wastewater reclamation plant (e.g., membrane bioreactor facility) in lieu of purchasing additional treatment capacity rights. The three agencies are in the process of retaining a consultant to prepare a more detailed feasibility study that would compare the various elements of this option to that associated with purchasing additional capacity. It is anticipated that the study will be completed in the next 4-6 months, at which time the City would be in a position to decide on an appropriate course of action. The reclamation plant could be a new source of supply of recycled water that would be conveyed by the Sweetwater Authority.</p>
<p>4. <u>Water</u></p> <p>That recycled water use be maximized where feasible throughout the City.</p>	<p>4. <u>Water</u></p> <p><u>Otay Water District</u>: The recycled water comment is fine and consistent with past and current practices.</p> <p><u>Sweetwater Authority</u>: Sweetwater Authority does not currently offer recycled water service in our service area, as there is no current local source of supply. The only source of recycled water is from the City of San Diego’s South Bay Water Reclamation Facility (SBWRF) located off Dairy Mart Road and Interstate 5. In response to the potential need for recycled</p>

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
	<p>water by the South Bay Power Plant reconstruction and proposed Bayfront development, the Authority completed a Recycled Water Master Plan in 2005. To have the cost of recycled water less than potable water, the implementation of the recommendations hinged on securing a large steady demand like a Recycled Water (RW) Cooled power generation plant proposed by Duke (currently operated by LS). Since that time, the air-cooled option has become more desirable for a replacement power plant in the Bayfront, reducing the potential for implementing a recycled water distribution system. There is another option of providing a source of recycled water supply that would be located in the Chula Vista area that is being explored by the staff of both Chula Vista and the Authority. This is described in more detail in the Sewer section.</p> <p>The Authority does, however, provide water reclamation via its Reynolds Groundwater Desalination Facility located at the northern Chula Vista area. Groundwater is treated and reclaimed to potable water, and delivered to customers in the service area, including Chula Vista. The flow rate ranges from 2 to 4 million gallons per day (mgd), or as much as 20 % of the average day demand. The Authority is currently in planning stages to expand this facility to as much as 8 mgd.</p>
<p>5. <u>Libraries</u></p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continue efforts to expedite delivery of the new Rancho del Rey branch library, 2) Actively pursue planning for a new Eastern Urban Center branch library, 3) Continue to assess the optimum hours of operation in terms of serving the needs of service area patrons, and 4) Assess ultimate future library needs based upon the increased capacity for 	<p>5. <u>Libraries</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Design of the Rancho del Rey branch library is under way with construction expected to begin by January 2007. 2) Pre-planning has already begun on the Eastern Urban Center branch library. 3) Through its strategic planning process, the Library continually evaluates all levels of public service, including hours of operation.

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
future growth provided by the City's updated General Plan, and accordingly update the Library Facilities Master Plan.	4) The Library is in the process of determining when or if it needs to update its Facilities Master Plan. A decision will be made in the coming year.
<p>6. <u>Drainage</u></p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to provide status reports addressing drainage projects to the GMOC twice per year, generally coinciding with submittal of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Budget and submittal of the annual GMOC questionnaire response. The GMOC supports continuing efforts to secure additional funding for enhancements to the drainage system and to be proactive in minimizing the potential for future drainage and flooding problems.</p>	<p>6. <u>Drainage</u></p> <p>Concur with recommendations. Following Council adoption of the GMOC Annual Report, City staff will devise a consistent reporting format.</p>
<p>7. <u>Parks and Recreation</u></p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to complete the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update as soon as feasible, along with an active effort to identify new sites and a program for funding anticipated new growth needs in western Chula Vista.</p> <p>The GMOC also recommends to the City Council that in planning for the future development of a major city park, the City of Chula Vista centennial anniversary in 2011 be taken into consideration, where a park or parks could reflect a theme related to Chula Vista's history and accomplishments.</p>	<p>7. <u>Parks and Recreation</u></p> <p>Recreation Department concurs. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update is currently underway. Staff anticipates a public draft by Fall 2006.</p> <p>Recreation Department concurs.</p>
<p>8. <u>Police</u></p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to have the Police Department prepare and implement an action plan addressing the decline in performance</p>	<p>8. <u>Police</u></p> <p>The Police Department completed a 5-year Strategic Business Plan in early 2005 that includes six major goals; addressing GMOC priority call</p>

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
relative to meeting the GMOC threshold for Priority 2 calls. The GMOC recommends that this be done expeditiously so that progress in developing and implementing the plan can be reflected in the Police Department's report in next year's GMOC review.	thresholds is goal number three. In the FY 04-05 reporting period, the Department was required to achieve \$1.6 million in salary savings, which had a detrimental effect on staffing. The City Council recently approved the Department's 5-year Strategic Business Plan, which included funding for 17 new officers, the reduction of mandatory salary savings, and the implementation of an overhire program for 10 officers to eliminate recruiting lag time in the hiring process. These additional officers, along with future officers requested in the Strategic Plan, are expected to positively impact Priority 2 response times.
<p>9. <u>Fire / Emergency Medical Services</u></p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to complete the Fire Facility Master Plan update and other related studies as soon as feasible.</p> <p>That the City Council direct the City Manager to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continue the recently re-established emergency response reporting function that furnishes information by station and identifies the dispatch, turnout, and travel time components, and 2) Ensure an internal review process is in place to address issues identified and take corrective actions in a timely manner when needed. The GMOC also recommends that a consistent reporting period be used in the future for reporting annual response time data. The enhanced tracking and reporting capabilities of the City's system should facilitate this effort. 	<p>9. <u>Fire / Emergency Medical Services</u></p> <p>The Chula Vista Fire Department concurs with the GMOC recommendations. The Chula Vista Fire Department will continue to pursue developing reporting capabilities necessary to provide fire station specific data on dispatching, turnout and travel times. The department will also continue to refine its internal review process of performance data in order to ensure that timely corrective actions are taken in response to GMOC related issues. This includes using consistent time periods for GMOC analyses that will allow comparisons between respective reporting periods.</p>
<p>10. <u>Traffic</u></p> <p>No Recommendations.</p>	<p>10. <u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Response not required.</p>

APPENDIX A

2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC) RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p>11. <u>Schools</u></p> <p>Sweetwater Union High School District – The GMOC recommends that agreements for shared use of the Olympic-sized pool facility reflected in plans for the Middle School 12/High School 14 campus in Otay Ranch be addressed as a priority given the high demand anticipated.</p>	<p>11. <u>Schools</u></p> <p>Sweetwater's planned 7-12 school is scheduled for opening in July 2008 or later. As plans evolve from conceptual to design schematic Sweetwater intends to engage private parties and the City of Chula Vista about a partnership for owning/managing/using the pool.</p>

H:\PLANNING\DanF\df\files\GMOC\GMOC-06\Annual_Report\Adopted_06-15-06.doc